



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,420	01/24/2002	Ronald B. Moss	P-IM 5158	8063
23601	7590	11/17/2004	EXAMINER	
CAMPBELL & FLORES LLP 4370 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE 7TH FLOOR SAN DIEGO, CA 92122			PARKIN, JEFFREY S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/056,420

Applicant(s)

MOSS, RONALD B., ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Serial No.: 10/056,420

Applicants: Moss, R. B., and D. J. Carlo

Docket No.: P-IM 5158

Filing Date: 01/24/02

## Response to Amendment

### *Status of the Claims*

Acknowledgement is hereby made of receipt and entry of the communication filed 25 June, 2004. No amendment to the claims accompanied the response. Claims 1-26 are pending in the instant application.

### *35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims are directed toward a method of treating HIV-infected individuals through structured treatment interruptions (STIs) with immune-based therapies. Antiviral therapy is ceased and patients are immunized with an "HIV immunogenic composition" that presumably leads to an immune system boost.

As previously set forth, the legal considerations that govern enablement determinations pertaining to undue experimentation have been clearly set forth. *Enzo Biochem, Inc.*, 52 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (C.A.F.C. 1999). *In re Wands*, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d 1400 (C.A.F.C. 1988). *Ex parte Forman* 230 U.S.P.Q. 546 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. Int., 1986). The courts concluded that several factual inquiries should be

considered when making such assessments including the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims. *In re Rainer*, 52 C.C.P.A. 1593, 347 F.2d 574, 146 U.S.P.Q. 218 (1965). The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to a number of these considerations as follows:

**1) The state-of-the-art as it pertains to HIV-1 and -2 vaccine development is replete with failure.** To date, there are no successful HIV-1 or -2 vaccines. The failure to identify and develop suitable vaccines has been due to several factors including: (i) the failure to identify the correlates of protective immunity; (ii) the failure to identify suitable immunogens, adjuvants, routes of administration, and immunization regimens; (iii) the quasispecies nature of lentiviral infection which leads to immune escape, and (iv) the lack of an adequate animal model that is reasonably predictive of clinical efficacy (Haynes *et al.*, 1996; Lee, 1997; Letvin, 1998; Burton and Moore, 1998; Johnston, 2000; Feinberg and Moore, 2002). Applicants' response failed to provide any objective scientific evidence that addresses these issues.

**2) The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the correlates of protective or therapeutic immunity.** In order to assess the true effectiveness of any given immunogen, the skilled artisan would need to know the nature, duration, and specificity of the immune response that confers a salubrious effect on the patient. However, the disclosure and applicants' response fails to provide any guidance pertaining to this subject.

**3) The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the preparation of suitable immunogens, adjuvants, routes of**

administration, and immunization regimens. In order to practice the claimed invention, the skilled artisan would require a knowledge of these parameters. However, the disclosure is silent pertaining to these various parameters.

4) **The disclosure fails to provide any working embodiments.** It was noted that the disclosure provided some preliminary data from a small clinical sample involving the immunogen REMUNE. However, this data cannot be relied upon at this point in time for enablement purposes. It is not readily apparent from reviewing the data that the STI regimen followed by REMUNE immunization was actually providing a therapeutic or protective immune response. The example failed to provide details about the immunological status of each patient participating in the trial. The study failed to measure meaningful immunological and virological indices that would be predictive of vaccine efficacy. Applicants' response failed to provide any objective scientific data addressing this deficiency.

5) **The claims are of considerable breadth and encompass any "HIV immunogenic composition."** As noted *supra*, there are a number of limitations associated with vaccine development including the identification of suitable immunogens and the correlates of protective immunity. The disclosure fails to provide adequate support for an given HIV immunogen.

Accordingly, when all the aforementioned factors are considered *in toto*, it would clearly require undue experimentation from the skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicants traverse and submit that the specification fully enables the claimed invention. This argument is not deemed to be persuasive. Applicants are reminded that the claims are directed toward a structured treatment interruption (STI) method employing an HIV immunogen. Accordingly, the expectation is that the HIV

immunogen of interest will provide a positive immune response that will result in a meaningful clinical outcome. The state-of-the-art concerning HIV immunogens and vaccine development is clearly one of unpredictability. The correlates of human protection remain to be elucidated. Thus, the nature, specificity, and titer of the immune response required for a therapeutic effect remains to be determined. Moreover, several HIV immunogens have undergone clinical trials and failed to generate a meaningful immune response. This is not surprising considering the unpredictability of the field. Applicants' response failed to provide any objective scientific data that addressed any of the concerns raised *supra*. Accordingly, the rejection is proper and hereby maintained.

#### *Finality of Office Action*

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.


#### *Correspondence*

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0908. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 10:30 AM to 9:00 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful,

the examiner's supervisor, James C. Housel, can be reached at (571) 272-0902. Direct general status inquiries to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist at (571) 272-1600. Formal communications may be submitted through the official facsimile number which is (703) 872-9306. Hand-carried formal communications should be directed toward the customer window located in Crystal Plaza Two, 2011 South Clark Place, Arlington, VA. Applicants are directed toward the O.G. Notice for further guidance. 1280 O.G. 681. Informal communications may be submitted to the Examiner's RightFAX account at (571) 273-0908.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Respectfully,



Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1648

12 November, 2004